



AI Powered Credit Scoring: Understanding Lender Perspectives and Adoption Dynamics

Dr. Sunil Lalchandani Head, Department of Management Studies, Smt. CHM College (Affiliated to University of Mumbai)

Dr. Kesar Lalchandani Head, Department of Accountancy, LDS College (Affiliated to University of Mumbai)

Varun Jashnani

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Smt. CHM College (Affiliated to University of Mumbai)

Abstract:

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in credit scoring has the potential to revolutionize the financial industry by significantly enhancing the accuracy and efficiency of assessing borrowers' creditworthiness. This research aims to explore the multifaceted dimensions of AIbased credit scoring through four primary objectives. The study will examine the various benefits and challenges associated with implementing AI in credit scoring, highlighting key advantages such as improved risk assessment, faster processing times, and the capability to analyze large datasets for more informed lending decisions. However, several challenges, including data privacy concerns, algorithmic bias, and regulatory compliance, may hinder the widespread adoption of these innovative technologies in financial institutions. Furthermore, the research delves into the attitudes of lenders regarding the use of AI in credit scoring, recognizing that understanding these attitudes is critical, as they significantly influence the acceptance and integration of AI technologies into financial practices. The study seeks to identify the factors that shape lenders' attitude towards the AI based credit scoring model. These factors encompass organizational readiness, technological infrastructure, and the regulatory landscape, all of which play a vital role in determining the effectiveness of AI implementations within financial institutions. Based on the insights gained from this research, actionable recommendations for financial institutions and policymakers will be provided, aimed at enhancing the adoption and effectiveness of AI-based credit scoring systems. Through primary data collection from lenders across various financial sectors, this research will offer valuable insights into the evolving dynamics of credit scoring in the age of AI, ultimately facilitating informed decision-making in the integration of innovative financial technologies.

Keywords: AI-Powered Credit Scoring, Financial Institutions, Lender Perceptions, Risk Assessment Technology

1. Introduction:

1.1 Introduction to Credit Scoring

Credit scoring is a critical process in the financial sector that determines the creditworthiness of individuals and businesses. It serves as a key factor in lending decisions, influencing whether a borrower is approved for credit and under what terms. Traditionally, credit scoring relied on historical data from credit reports, which were compiled by credit bureaus based on payment histories, outstanding debts, and other financial behaviors. This method, while useful, has inherent limitations, such as its reliance on limited data sources, which can lead to inaccuracies in evaluating the creditworthiness of individuals with little or no credit history, often referred to as "thin-file" borrowers. The need for more robust and accurate credit assessment mechanisms has paved the way for the adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) in credit scoring.

1.2 Emergence of AI in Credit Scoring

Artificial intelligence, a branch of computer science that focuses on creating systems capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence, has found its place in various sectors, including finance. In recent years, the integration of AI into credit scoring systems has emerged as a transformative trend. By leveraging machine learning algorithms, natural language processing, and advanced data analytics, financial institutions can enhance their credit assessment processes significantly. AI systems can analyze vast amounts of data in real-time, identifying patterns and trends that human analysts might overlook. As a result, AI-powered credit scoring models are not only more efficient but also capable of delivering insights that improve the overall accuracy of credit evaluations.

1.3 Benefits of AI-Based Credit Scoring

1.3.1 Improved Accuracy

One of the most significant advantages of AI-based credit scoring is the improvement in accuracy. Traditional credit scoring models often rely on a limited set of data, which may not adequately reflect a borrower's financial behavior. In contrast, AI systems can analyze diverse data sources, including social media activity, online transactions, and even behavioral patterns, leading to a more holistic view of an individual's creditworthiness. This enhanced accuracy reduces the likelihood of false negatives—situations where creditworthy individuals are wrongly classified as unworthy of credit—thereby broadening access to credit for deserving borrowers.

1.3.2 Efficiency and Speed

AI-driven credit scoring systems offer remarkable efficiency and speed compared to traditional methods. In conventional lending practices, the credit evaluation process can be time-consuming, often taking days or even weeks. However, AI can automate many aspects of this process, allowing for near-instantaneous credit assessments. This not only improves customer satisfaction by providing quicker responses to credit applications but also enables financial institutions to process a higher volume of applications without a proportional increase in operational costs.

1.3.3 Access to Diverse Data Sources

The ability to utilize non-traditional data sources is another key benefit of AI in credit scoring. Traditional models often rely solely on credit history, which excludes a significant portion of the population, particularly younger individuals or those new to credit. AI systems can incorporate alternative data, such as utility payments, rental history, and other financial behaviors, which can provide insights into the creditworthiness of individuals who might otherwise be overlooked. This inclusive approach can promote greater financial inclusion and allow more people access to essential credit services.

1.3.4 Risk Assessment and Fraud Detection

AI technologies also enhance risk assessment and fraud detection capabilities within credit scoring. Machine learning algorithms can analyze transaction patterns and flag anomalies indicative of potential fraud, allowing lenders to take proactive measures to mitigate risk. Additionally, AI can continually learn and adapt to new fraud techniques, ensuring that credit scoring systems remain effective in identifying and managing risks over time.

1.3.5 Cost Reduction

The implementation of AI in credit scoring can lead to substantial cost reductions for financial institutions. Automation of the credit evaluation process minimizes the need for extensive manual labor, thereby lowering operational costs. Moreover, by reducing default rates through improved risk assessment, AI can ultimately contribute to healthier profit margins for lenders.

1.4 Challenges of AI-Based Credit Scoring

1.4.1 Data Privacy and Security

Despite its advantages, the integration of AI in credit scoring also presents several challenges, particularly concerning data privacy and security. The collection and utilization of vast amounts of personal data raise significant ethical and regulatory concerns. Consumers may be wary of how their data is used, especially if they feel that it is collected without their consent or understanding. Financial institutions must navigate these privacy concerns while ensuring compliance with regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in Europe and similar laws in other jurisdictions. The challenge lies in balancing the need for data to make informed lending decisions with the obligation to protect consumer privacy.

1.4.2 Algorithmic Bias

Algorithmic bias is another critical challenge in AI-based credit scoring. If the training data used to develop AI models contains biases—whether based on race, gender, or socio-economic status—the resulting credit scoring systems may perpetuate these biases, leading to unfair and discriminatory outcomes. Addressing this issue requires financial institutions to be vigilant about the data they use and to regularly audit their AI systems for bias. Moreover, the lack of diversity

in the teams developing AI technologies can further exacerbate this issue, making it imperative to involve a wide range of perspectives in the development and implementation of these systems.

1.4.3 Transparency and Explainability

Transparency and explainability are vital considerations in the context of AI-driven credit scoring. Many AI algorithms operate as "black boxes," meaning that their decision-making processes are not easily understood by humans. This lack of transparency can create challenges when lenders need to explain credit decisions to applicants. If borrowers cannot comprehend why they were denied credit, it can lead to frustration and distrust in the financial system. As regulatory scrutiny of AI technologies increases, financial institutions must prioritize the development of AI models that are not only effective but also transparent and explainable.

1.4.4 Regulatory Compliance

Navigating the regulatory landscape is another significant challenge for financial institutions adopting AI in credit scoring. The regulatory environment for AI is continually evolving, and institutions must ensure that their AI models comply with existing laws while adapting to new regulations. This may involve ongoing assessments of how AI tools are applied and their impact on credit decisions. Regulatory bodies may require organizations to demonstrate the fairness and accuracy of their AI systems, which can necessitate additional resources and expertise.

1.4.5 Lender Attitudes and Acceptance

The acceptance of AI technologies by traditional lenders is also a crucial factor influencing the successful implementation of AI-based credit scoring. Some lenders may be resistant to adopting new technologies due to concerns about job displacement, the reliability of AI models, or the perceived complexity of these systems. Financial institutions must invest in training and education to help lenders understand the benefits of AI and address any fears or misconceptions they may have about its impact on their roles.

1.5 About the Present Study

While AI-based credit scoring presents significant opportunities for improving accuracy, efficiency, and inclusivity in lending practices, it also poses challenges that must be carefully managed. Addressing data privacy concerns, mitigating algorithmic bias, ensuring transparency, and navigating regulatory compliance are critical for the successful implementation of AI in credit scoring. Understanding the attitudes of lenders toward these changes will also play a crucial role in shaping the future of credit scoring. The study also aims at investigating the underlying factors that influence the attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI based credit scoring models. By examining both the benefits and challenges of AI-based credit scoring, this study aims to provide insights that can guide financial institutions and policymakers in enhancing the adoption and effectiveness of these systems.

2. Objectives:

The paper serves the following objectives:

- To examine the benefits and challenges of AI-based credit scoring.
- To examine the attitude of lenders regarding the use of AI in credit scoring.
- To understand the factors that influence the attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI based Credit Scoring.
- To provide recommendations to financial institutions and policymakers on enhancing the adoption and effectiveness of AI-based credit scoring systems.

3. Hypothesis:

3.1 First Hypothesis:

- **H0:** The attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI-based credit scoring is not significantly positive.
- H1: The attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI-based credit scoring is significantly positive.

3.2 Second Hypothesis:

- **H0:** There is no significant relationship between the attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI-based credit scoring and the underlying influencing factors.
- **H2:** There is a significant relationship between the attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI-based credit scoring and the underlying influencing factors.

4. The Problem Statement:

The integration of AI-based credit scoring systems in the lending industry presents both significant benefits and challenges. Despite the potential for improved accuracy, efficiency, and risk assessment, the adoption of AI remains inconsistent among lenders. This study aims to investigate lenders' attitudes toward AI in credit scoring and identify the key factors influencing these attitudes, such as knowledge, trust, and institutional support. Furthermore, it seeks to provide actionable recommendations for financial institutions and policymakers to enhance the effectiveness and adoption of AI-based credit scoring systems, ultimately aiming to streamline lending processes and improve decision-making in the financial sector.

5. Research Methodology

5.1 Research Design

This study adopts a quantitative research design to examine the benefits and challenges of AIbased credit scoring, along with the attitudes and perceptions of lenders regarding its adoption. The research aims to gather empirical data for statistical analysis to draw meaningful conclusions.

5.2 Sample Size and Population

The target population comprises professionals involved in credit assessment and risk management within banks and financial institutions located in the Mumbai region. A total of 100 respondents, including loan managers, risk analysts, and credit managers, are selected for this study.

5.3 Sampling Technique

A random sampling technique is employed to select participants, ensuring that every individual in the target population has an equal chance of being included. This approach enhances the generalizability of the findings and mitigates selection bias.

5.4 Data Collection Methods

The research utilizes both primary and secondary data collection methods.

- **5.4.1 Primary Data Collection:** A structured questionnaire is distributed to the selected respondents. The questionnaire consists of closed-ended questions using a five-point Likert scale to gauge lenders' attitudes and perceptions regarding AI-based credit scoring.
- **5.4.2** Secondary Data Collection: Secondary data is gathered from academic and industry sources, including journals, books, and credible reports. This data provides a foundational understanding of existing literature and contextualizes the primary findings.

5.5 Data Analysis

The collected data is analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

- **5.5.1 T-Test:** A T-Test is used to compare the means of different groups (e.g., attitudes towards AI-based credit scoring among various professional roles) to assess statistically significant differences.
- **5.5.2 Bi-Variate Analysis:** Bi-variate analysis explores relationships between two variables, focusing on the correlation between lenders' perceptions of AI adoption and the underlying influencing factors.

5.6 Ethical Considerations

The study adheres to ethical research practices, ensuring that all participants provide informed consent before participating. Confidentiality and anonymity are maintained, and participants can withdraw from the study at any time without repercussions.

6. Review of Literature:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing the financial services sector, particularly in credit scoring. Traditional credit scoring methodologies primarily rely on historical data and simplistic

linear models, which may not effectively capture the complexities of borrower behavior. Recent studies indicate that AI's ability to analyze large volumes of diverse data presents substantial advantages over conventional credit assessment techniques. For instance, Khandani, Kim, and Lo (2010) demonstrate that machine learning algorithms can outperform traditional models by integrating alternative data sources, such as social media activity and transaction histories, to create a more comprehensive view of a borrower's creditworthiness. This approach has led to improved predictive accuracy and lower default rates, allowing lenders to identify creditworthy borrowers who may have been overlooked by traditional scoring systems.

In addition to enhanced accuracy, AI-based credit scoring systems also contribute to greater efficiency in the loan application process. Ghosh and Reilly (2020) find that AI algorithms can significantly reduce processing times, enabling quicker credit decisions and enhancing customer satisfaction. The efficiency gains from implementing AI not only streamline operations for financial institutions but also allow for better resource allocation and focus on value-added services.

Moreover, AI plays a crucial role in risk management within lending. Feng et al. (2020) highlight that AI models can continuously learn from new data, which enables them to adapt to changes in borrower behavior and market conditions. This adaptability improves predictive accuracy and helps lenders identify emerging risks, thereby mitigating potential losses. As the financial landscape continues to evolve, such dynamic risk assessment capabilities are increasingly critical.

Despite these advantages, the adoption of AI in credit scoring presents several challenges. A primary concern is the potential for algorithmic bias. Obermeyer et al. (2019) argue that historical data may reflect existing societal biases, which can inadvertently be learned and perpetuated by AI systems. If left unaddressed, these biases may lead to discriminatory lending practices that disproportionately impact marginalized groups. This highlights the necessity for financial institutions to implement fairness-aware algorithms and rigorous testing to identify and mitigate bias within credit scoring models.

Another significant challenge is the interpretability of AI models. Many AI algorithms operate as "black boxes," making it challenging for lenders to understand the rationale behind specific credit decisions. Lipton (2016) emphasizes that transparency is critical in sensitive areas such as credit scoring, where decisions can have substantial consequences for borrowers. The lack of clear explanations for credit decisions can lead to regulatory scrutiny and erode consumer trust.

Data privacy and security also emerge as crucial considerations in the implementation of AIbased credit scoring. The use of alternative data raises pertinent questions regarding the protection of sensitive information. Zarsky (2016) discusses the legal and ethical implications of utilizing personal data in credit assessments, underscoring the need for robust data protection measures to maintain consumer trust and adhere to regulatory frameworks.

Lender perceptions are integral to the adoption and implementation of AI-based credit scoring systems. Chuen et al. (2017) reveal that while many lenders acknowledge the potential benefits of AI, they often express concerns regarding the associated challenges. Issues related to algorithmic bias, data privacy, and interpretability can impede the acceptance of AI technologies

in credit assessment processes. Moreover, the organizational culture within financial institutions significantly shapes lender attitudes toward AI adoption. Ranjan et al. (2020) indicate that institutions with a technology-oriented culture are more likely to embrace AI-driven credit scoring systems, whereas those resistant to change may struggle to implement innovative technologies.

Training and education are also essential for fostering positive lender perceptions. Kauffman et al. (2022) argue that a lack of understanding regarding AI and its capabilities can hinder acceptance among lenders. Financial institutions must invest in comprehensive training programs to ensure that employees possess the skills necessary to effectively utilize AI in credit scoring.

In summary, the literature underscores that AI-based credit scoring systems offer considerable benefits, including improved accuracy, efficiency, and risk management capabilities. However, the challenges of algorithmic bias, interpretability, and data privacy must be proactively addressed to ensure fair lending practices. Lender perceptions play a pivotal role in the successful adoption of these technologies, influenced by organizational culture and the availability of training. As the financial sector continues to explore the potential of AI in credit scoring, ongoing research is vital to navigate these complexities and harness the benefits while mitigating associated risks.

Research Gap:

Despite the growing interest in AI-based credit scoring, significant gaps remain in the existing literature. While numerous studies have emphasized the benefits of AI, such as improved predictive accuracy and operational efficiency, research specifically addressing the challenges and concerns associated with its adoption—like algorithmic bias, interpretability, and data privacy remains limited. Additionally, there is insufficient exploration of the factors influencing lenders' perceptions toward AI in credit scoring, which directly affects its adoption in financial institutions. This study aims to fill these gaps by understanding lenders' attitudes, and assessing the factors that influence their perceptions. By addressing these issues, the research contributes valuable insights for financial institutions and policymakers seeking to enhance the effectiveness of AI-driven credit scoring systems.

7. Findings, Analysis and Interpretation:

AI-based credit scoring offers numerous benefits, including enhanced accuracy in risk assessment, faster processing times, and the ability to analyze vast amounts of data for better decision-making.

However, challenges such as algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, and concerns over data privacy and security pose significant hurdles to its widespread adoption in the financial sector.

The attitude of most of the respondents is positive towards adoption of AI based credit scoring models.

Various Factors can influence the attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI based credit scoring. These factors include: Knowledge and Familiarity with AI Technology, Past Experiences with AI or Automated Systems, Trust in AI Algorithms, Institutional Risk Appetite, Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change, Technological Infrastructure and Resources, Regulatory and Legal Environment, Market Competition and Industry Trends, Economic and Business Environment, Customer Expectations and Demand, Perceived Financial Impact and Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise

Hypothesis Testing:

First Hypothesis

- **H0:** The attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI-based credit scoring is not significantly positive.
- H1: The attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI-based credit scoring is significantly positive.

Data was collected from the respondents on a 5 point scale to measure the attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI based credit scoring system, 1 means strongly Disagree and 5 means Strongly Agree.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
I have a clear understanding of how AI- based credit scoring works.	100	4.3900	.82749	.08275
Implementing AI in credit scoring will significantly improve the efficiency of the loan approval process.	100	4.6300	.54411	.05441
I believe that AI-based credit scoring can enhance the accuracy of credit assessments.	100	4.6500	.53889	.05389
I trust that AI-based credit scoring can help reduce human bias in credit assessments.	100	4.6000	.55048	.05505
I believe that AI-based credit scoring will lead to higher customer satisfaction due to faster decision-making.	100	4.6100	.58422	.05842
I am confident that AI-based credit scoring systems can comply with existing regulations and ethical standards.	100	4.6800	.52953	.05295
I see AI-based credit scoring as a cost- effective solution for my organization.	100	4.6900	.52599	.05260
Adopting AI-based credit scoring will provide my organization with a competitive advantage in the market.	100	4.6800	.52953	.05295
I believe that my organization provides adequate training and support for implementing AI-based credit scoring systems.	100	4.6800	.52953	.05295

Applying One Sample T-Test in SPSS we get the following results: Table 1: One-Sample Statistics

I am optimistic about the long-term benefits of adopting AI-based credit scoring in my organization	100	4.6500	.53889	.05389
My organization is willing to adapt to new technologies like AI-based credit scoring.	100	4.6800	.54828	.05483
I believe that the adoption of AI-based credit scoring will not negatively impact employment in my organization.	100	4.6300	.54411	.05441
Attitude of Lenders	100	4.6308	.46590	.04659

Table 2: One-Sample Test Test Value = 4

		1	est value – 4				
					95% Confidence Interval of t		
		16		Mean	Differe	Ilanan	
T 1 1 1 1 1	l	d1 00	Sig. (2-tailed)	Difference	Lower	Opper	
I have a clear understanding of how AI-based credit scoring works.	4./13	99	.000	.39000	.2258	.5542	
Implementing AI in credit scoring will significantly improve the efficiency of the loan approval process.	11.578	99	.000	.63000	.5220	.7380	
I believe that AI-based credit scoring can enhance the accuracy of credit assessments.	12.062	99	.000	.65000	.5431	.7569	
I trust that AI-based credit scoring can help reduce human bias in credit assessments.	10.900	99	.000	.60000	.4908	.7092	
I believe that AI-based credit scoring will lead to higher customer satisfaction due to faster decision- making.	10.441	99	.000	.61000	.4941	.7259	
I am confident that AI-based credit scoring systems can comply with existing regulations and ethical standards.	12.842	99	.000	.68000	.5749	.7851	
I see AI-based credit scoring as a cost-effective solution for my organization.	13.118	99	.000	.69000	.5856	.7944	
Adopting AI-based credit scoring will provide my organization with a competitive advantage in the market.	12.842	99	.000	.68000	.5749	.7851	
I believe that my organization provides adequate training and support for implementing AI-based credit scoring systems.	12.842	99	.000	.68000	.5749	.7851	
I am optimistic about the long-term benefits of adopting AI-based credit scoring in my organization.	12.062	99	.000	.65000	.5431	.7569	

My organization is willing to adapt to new technologies like AI-based credit scoring.	12.403	99	.000	.68000	.5712	.7888
I believe that the adoption of AI-based credit scoring will not negatively impact employment in my organization.	11.578	99	.000	.63000	.5220	.7380
Attitude of Lenders	13.540	99	.000	.63083	.5384	.7233

- **Test Value = 4**: The null hypothesis states that the attitude is not significantly positive, i.e., the mean is not significantly greater than 4.
- t: The t-value for each statement is quite high (ranging from 4.713 to 13.118), indicating a significant difference between the sample mean and the test value of 4.
- **df** (Degrees of Freedom): All statements have df = 99, as this is based on the sample size of 100.
- Sig. (2-tailed): The significance level (p-value) is 0.000 for all statements, which is less than the common alpha level of 0.05. This leads us to reject the null hypothesis for all statements. Therefore, there is strong evidence to support the alternative hypothesis.
- Mean Difference: This column indicates the average difference between the sample mean and the test value (4), which ranges from 0.390 to 0.690, all indicating a positive attitude.
- 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference: The confidence intervals for all statements do not include zero (e.g., 0.2258 to 0.5542 for the first statement), reinforcing the conclusion that lenders' attitudes are significantly positive towards AI-based credit scoring.

Overall Interpretation

The analysis shows that *lenders have a significantly positive attitude towards the adoption of AI-based credit scoring*, as evidenced by the high mean scores and significant p-values. All 12 statements received a mean score well above 4, indicating strong agreement among respondents that AI can improve various aspects of credit scoring, from accuracy and efficiency to reducing bias and enhancing customer satisfaction.

Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected, and it can be concluded that the attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI-based credit scoring is significantly positive, thus supporting the alternative hypothesis. *These findings suggest that financial institutions can be optimistic about implementing AI-based credit scoring systems, as they are likely to receive positive feedback from key stakeholders in the lending process.*

Second Hypothesis

- **H0:** There is no significant relationship between the attitude of lenders regarding the adoption of AI-based credit scoring and the underlying influencing factors.
- H2: There is a significant relationship between the attitude of lenders regarding the adoption of AI-based credit scoring and the underlying influencing factors.

Data was collected from the respondents on a 5 point scale to measure the attitude of lenders towards the adoption of AI based credit scoring system, 1 means strongly Disagree and 5 means Strongly Agree.

.000

.000

.000

.001

.006

.000

.000

.538

Knowledge and Familiarity with Al Technology2.00Disagree73.00Neutral114.00Agree325.00Strongly Agree45Past Experiences with Al or Automated Systems3.00Neutral114.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree62Trust in Al Algorithms3.00Neutral74.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree58Institutional Risk Appetite3.00Neutral94.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree56Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral64.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral56.00Strongly Agree66700Strongly Agree66700Strongly Agree67700Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral73.00Neutral33.00Neutral3700Strongly Agree683.00Neutral37103.00Neutral33.00Neutral37203.00Strongly Agree683.003.00730Strongly Agree683.00Neutral37403.00Neutral33.003.007403.00Neutral3 </th <th></th> <th></th> <th>Value Label</th> <th>N</th>			Value Label	N
3.00Neutral164.00Agree325.00Strongly Agree45Past Experiences with AI or Automated Systems3.00Neutral114.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree662Trust in AI Algorithms3.00Neutral74.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree355.00Strongly Agree35100Neutral94.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree36Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral66.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree6595.00Strongly Agree6596.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree6.00Strongly Agree68300Neutral73.00Neutral75.00Strongly Agree68300Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral33.00Neutral30Strongly Agree685.00Strongly Agree68300Neutral36.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree685.00Strongly Agree68300Neutral66.00Agree300Neutral<	Knowledge and Familiarity with AI Technology	2.00	Disagree	7
4.00Agree325.00Strongly Agree		3.00	Neutral	16
5.00Strongly Agree45Past Experiences with AI or Automated Systems3.00Neutral114.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree62Trust in AI Algorithms3.00Neutral74.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree58Institutional Risk Appetite3.00Neutral94.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree56Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral65.00Strongly Agree665.00Strongly Agree65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral55.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree2255.00Strongly Agree70Stongly Agree605.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree2265.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree235.00Strongly Agree6705.00Strongly Agree686868Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree36.00Neutral55.0051005.00Strongly Agree59500510075.00Strongly Agree597 <td></td> <td>4.00</td> <td>Agree</td> <td>32</td>		4.00	Agree	32
Past Experiences with AI or Automated Systems3.00Neutral114.00Agree2.75.00Strongly Agree6.2Trust in AI Algorithms3.00Neutral74.00Agree3.55.00Strongly Agree5.8Institutional Risk Appetite3.00Neutral94.00Agree3.6Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral6Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral673.00Neutral6664.00Agree2.95.005.00Strongly Agree6.566Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral565.00Strongly Agree7.07.0Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree2.55.00Strongly Agree6.65.00Strongly Agree6.67.07.0Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral34.00Agree2.67.07.05.00Strongly Agree7.17.07.06.00Strongly Agree3.00Neutral36.00Strongly Agree3.07.17.16.00Strongly Agree3.07.17.16.00Strongly Agree3.07.17.17.00Strongly Agree3.07.17.1 <t< td=""><td></td><td>5.00</td><td>Strongly Agree</td><td>45</td></t<>		5.00	Strongly Agree	45
4.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree62Trust in AI Algorithms3.00Neutral74.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree58Institutional Risk Appetite3.00Neutral94.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree56Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral64.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral56.00Strongly Agree65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree6.00Strongly Agree6670Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree6.00Strongly Agree6670Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree26705.00Strongly Agree6870Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Neutral36.00Strongly Agree27705.00Strongly Agree28705.00Strongly Agree277073.00Neutral36.00Strongly Agree2775.00Strongly Agree2775.00Strongly Agree27	Past Experiences with AI or Automated Systems	3.00	Neutral	11
function5.00Strongly Agree62Trust in AI Algorithms3.00Neutral74.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree58Institutional Risk Appetite3.00Neutral94.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree35Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral64.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral6563.00Neutral70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral704.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral714.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral316.00Strongly Agree2626265.00Strongly Agree7130Fechnological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral95.00Strongly Agree29303005.00Strongly Agree35300Neutral64.00Agree29305.00Strongly Agree36300Neutral64.00Agree29305.00Strongly Agree36300Neutral63.00Neutral630 <td></td> <td>4.00</td> <td>Agree</td> <td>27</td>		4.00	Agree	27
		5.00	Strongly Agree	62
4.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree58Institutional Risk Appetite3.00Neutral94.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree56Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral64.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral54.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree6573.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree83.00Neutral734.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree5.00Strongly Agree6870Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree34.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree695.00Strongly Agree295.00Strongly Agree695.00Strongly Agree295.00Strongly Agree295.00Strongly Agree295.00Strongly Agree614.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree695.00Strongly Agree616464644.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree6163.00	Trust in AI Algorithms	3.00	Neutral	7
Institutional Risk Appetite5.00Strongly Agree58Institutional Risk Appetite3.00Neutral94.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree56Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral64.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral5563.00Neutral5573.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree73.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree83.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree63.00Neutral374.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral3.00Neutral34.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand3.00Neutral4.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral4.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree295.00Strongly Agree614.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree615.00Strongly Agree <td< td=""><td></td><td>4.00</td><td>Agree</td><td>35</td></td<>		4.00	Agree	35
Institutional Risk Appetite3.00Neutral94.00Agree.355.00Strongly Agree.56Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral.664.00Agree.295.00Strongly Agree.65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral.563.00Neutral.574.00Agree.255.00Strongly Agree.70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral.74.00Agree.25.500Strongly Agree.665.00Strongly Agree.66.60.70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral.74.00Agree.25.500Strongly Agree.68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral.3065.00Strongly Agree.68.71Economic and Business Environment3.00Neutral.5063.00Neutral.50.500.50063.00Neutral.99.500.50075.00Strongly Agree.68.5073.00Neutral.99.500.50073.00Neutral.99.500.50075.00Strongly Agree.59.500.50075.00Strongly Agree.29.500.50075.00Strongly Agree </td <td></td> <td>5.00</td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>58</td>		5.00	Strongly Agree	58
4.00Agree355.00Strongly Agree56Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Charge3.00Neutral4.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree66Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral54.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral774.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree715.00Strongly Agree715.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree2.00Disagree33.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise2.00Disagree2.00Disagree703.00Neutral64.00Agree303.00Neutral64.00Agree303.00Neutral63.00Neutral63.00Neutral64.00Agree303.00Neutral6 <t< td=""><td>Institutional Risk Appetite</td><td>3.00</td><td>Neutral</td><td>9</td></t<>	Institutional Risk Appetite	3.00	Neutral	9
5.00Strongly Agree5.6Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral64.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral54.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral55.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree33.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree30Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise2.00Disagree313.00Neutral64.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree703.00Neutral64.00Agree205.00Strongly Agree705.00Strongly Agree703.00Neutral64.00Agree <td></td> <td>4.00</td> <td>Agree</td> <td>35</td>		4.00	Agree	35
Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change3.00Neutral64.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral54.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree275.00Strongly Agree6933.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree693300Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree69700Neutral94.004.0094.0094.00Agree205.00Strongly Agree70700Neutral63.00Neutral665.00Strongly Agree70707070700Neutral67070707070700Neutral67070707070700Neut		5.00	Strongly Agree	56
4.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree65Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral54.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree615.00Strongly Agree71Economic and Business Environment3.00Neutral54.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree33.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree595.00Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral64.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise2.00Disagree113.00Neutral66663.00Neutral6663.00Neutral6664.00Agree30664.00Agree3066 <td>Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change</td> <td>3.00</td> <td>Neutral</td> <td>6</td>	Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change	3.00	Neutral	6
5.00Strongly Agree665Perceived Financial Impact3.00Neutral54.00Agree2255.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree2255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree2265.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree2265.00Strongly Agree684.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree33.00Neutral55.00Strongly Agree685.00Strongly Agree33.00Neutral64.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral664.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise2.00Disagree113.00Neutral64.00Agree3.00Neutral6665.00Strongly Agree705.00Strongly Agree665.00Strongly Agree3.00Neutral666666666666		4.00	Agree	29
Perceived Financial Impact 3.00 Neutral 5 4.00 Agree 25 5.00 Strongly Agree 70 Regulatory and Legal Environment 3.00 Neutral 7 4.00 Agree 25 5.00 Strongly Agree 68 Market Competition and Industry Trends 3.00 Neutral 3 4.00 Agree 26 5.00 Strongly Agree 68 Market Competition and Industry Trends 3.00 Neutral 3 4.00 Agree 26 5.00 Strongly Agree 71 Economic and Business Environment 3.00 Neutral 5 4.00 Agree 27 5.00 Strongly Agree 68 Customer Expectations and Demand 3.00 Neutral 9 4.00 Agree 30 5.00 Strongly Agree 59 Technological Infrastructure and Resources 3.00 Neutral 6 4.00 Agree 29 5.00 Strongly Agree 29 5.00 Strongly Agree 24 5.00 Strongly Agree 24 5.00 Strongly Agree 11 4.00 Agree 24 5.00 Strongly Agree 11 6 4.00 Agree 24 5.00 Strongly Agree 11 6 4.00 Agree 30 6 300 Neutral 6 6 300 Neutral 6		5.00	Strongly Agree	65
4.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree684.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree71Economic and Business Environment3.00Neutral54.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree682.00Disagree33.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree30Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral64.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise2.00Disagree13.00Neutral66604.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree705.00Strongly Agree10366604.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree705.00Strongly Agree13300Neutral64.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree635.00Strongly Agree305.00Strongly Agree635.00Strongly Agree303.00Strongly Agree63 </td <td>Perceived Financial Impact</td> <td>3.00</td> <td>Neutral</td> <td>5</td>	Perceived Financial Impact	3.00	Neutral	5
5.00Strongly Agree70Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree71Economic and Business Environment3.00Neutral34.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree714.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree33.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral64.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise3.00Neutral64.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree633.00Neutral66664.00Agree305.00555.00Strongly Agree63666.00Agree30666.00Agree30666.00Agree6366		4.00	Agree	25
Regulatory and Legal Environment3.00Neutral74.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree71Economic and Business Environment3.00Neutral54.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree33.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral64.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise2.00Disagree13.00Neutral64.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree63		5.00	Strongly Agree	70
4.00Agree255.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree71Economic and Business Environment3.00Neutral54.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree33.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral64.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree59Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise2.00Disagree13.00Neutral64.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree705.00Strongly Agree705.00Strongly Agree64.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree305.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree <td>Regulatory and Legal Environment</td> <td>3.00</td> <td>Neutral</td> <td>7</td>	Regulatory and Legal Environment	3.00	Neutral	7
5.00Strongly Agree68Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree71Economic and Business Environment3.00Neutral54.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree33.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral64.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise2.00Disagree13.00Neutral64.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree700Disagree305.00Strongly Agree664.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree63		4.00	Agree	25
Market Competition and Industry Trends3.00Neutral34.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree71Economic and Business Environment3.00Neutral54.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree33.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree295.00Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral4.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise2.00Disagree113.00Neutral64.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree64.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree64.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree6		5.00	Strongly Agree	68
4.00Agree265.00Strongly Agree71Economic and Business Environment3.00Neutral54.00Agree275.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand2.00Disagree33.00Neutral94.00Agree295.00Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources3.00Neutral64.00Agree245.00Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise2.00Disagree13.00Neutral64.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree70Strongly Agree30305.00Strongly Agree64.00Agree305.00Strongly Agree65.00Strongly Agree305.00Strongly Agree6	Market Competition and Industry Trends	3.00	Neutral	3
5.00Strongly Agree71Economic and Business Environment 3.00 Neutral5 4.00 Agree27 5.00 Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand 2.00 Disagree3 3.00 Neutral9 4.00 Agree29 5.00 Strongly Agree59Technological Infrastructure and Resources 3.00 Neutral6 4.00 Agree24 5.00 Strongly Agree70Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise 2.00 Disagree1 3.00 Neutral6 4.00 Agree30 5.00 Strongly Agree30 5.00 Strongly Agree30 5.00 Strongly Agree6 4.00 Agree30 5.00 Strongly Agree6 4.00 Agree30 5.00 Strongly Agree63		4.00	Agree	26
Economic and Business Environment 3.00 Neutral 5 4.00 Agree 27 5.00 Strongly Agree 68 Customer Expectations and Demand 2.00 Disagree 3.00 Neutral 9 4.00 Agree 29 5.00 Strongly Agree 29 5.00 Strongly Agree 59 Technological Infrastructure and Resources 3.00 Neutral 4.00 Agree 59 5.00 Strongly Agree 66 4.00 Agree 24 5.00 Strongly Agree 70 Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise 2.00 Disagree 2.00 Disagree 11 3.00 Neutral 66 4.00 Agree 30 5.00 Strongly Agree 63		5.00	Strongly Agree	71
	Economic and Business Environment	3.00	Neutral	5
5.00Strongly Agree68Customer Expectations and Demand 2.00 Disagree 3 3.00 Neutral 9 4.00 Agree 29 5.00 Strongly Agree 59 Technological Infrastructure and Resources 3.00 Neutral 6 4.00 Agree 24 5.00 Strongly Agree 70 Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise 2.00 Disagree 1 3.00 Neutral 6 4.00 Agree 30 5.00 Strongly Agree 1 3.00 Neutral 6 4.00 Agree 30 5.00 Strongly Agree 30 5.00 Strongly Agree 30 5.00 Strongly Agree 63		4.00	Agree	27
		5.00	Strongly Agree	68
	Customer Expectations and Demand	2.00	Disagree	3
		3.00	Neutral	9
		4.00	Agree	29
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		5.00	Strongly Agree	59
	Technological Infrastructure and Resources	3.00	Neutral	6
5.00 Strongly Agree 70 Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise 2.00 Disagree 1 3.00 Neutral 6 4.00 Agree 30 5.00 Strongly Agree 63		4.00	Agree	24
Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise 2.00 Disagree 1 3.00 Neutral 6 4.00 Agree 30 5.00 Strongly Agree 63		5.00	Strongly Agree	70
3.00 Neutral 6 4.00 Agree 30 5.00 Strongly Agree 63	Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise	2.00	Disagree	1
4.00 Agree 30 5.00 Strongly Agree 63		3.00	Neutral	6
5.00 Strongly Agree 63		4.00	Agree	30
		5.00	Strongly Agree	63

Applying Univariate Analysis (ANOVA) in SPSS we get the following results: Table 3: Between-Subjects Factors

Table 4: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Attitude of Lenders Type III Sum of Source Squares df Mean Square F Sig. Corrected Model 21.276^a 26 .818 279.891 Intercept 66.881 1 66.881 22875.567 f1 .204 3 .068 23.233 f2 .047 2 .023 7.967 f3 .032 2 .016 5.494 f4 .296 2 .148 50.701 f5 .123 2 .061 20.968 f6 .001 1 .001 .383

f7	.026	2	.013	4.361	.016
f8	1.031	2	.516	176.354	.000
f9	.016	1	.016	5.547	.021
f10	.029	3	.010	3.358	.023
f11	.040	2	.020	6.892	.002
f12	.100	3	.033	11.442	.000
Error	.213	73	.003		
Total	2165.951	100			
Corrected Total	21.490	99			

a. R Squared = .990 (Adjusted R Squared = .987)

Interpretation:

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Table 4)

This table provides the results of the ANOVA analysis, testing the significance of the relationship between the attitude of lenders and the influencing factors.

Key Findings:

- Corrected Model:
 - F(26, 73) = 279.891, p < 0.001 (Sig. = .000) This indicates that the model as a whole is statistically significant, meaning at least one of the factors significantly influences the attitude of lenders toward AIbased credit scoring.
- Intercept:
 - F(1, 73) = 22875.567, p < 0.001 (Sig. = .000)

This shows a strong overall significance for the intercept.

Individual Factors:

Each influencing factor's F-value and significance can be interpreted as follows:

- 1) Knowledge and Familiarity with AI Technology:
 - a. F(3, 73) = 23.233, p < 0.001Significant relationship.
- 2) Past Experiences with AI or Automated Systems:
 - a. F(2, 73) = 7.967, p = 0.001
 - Significant relationship.
- 3) **Trust in AI Algorithms**:
 - a. F(2, 73) = 5.494, p = 0.006Significant relationship.
- 4) Institutional Risk Appetite:
 - a. F(2, 73) = 50.701, p < 0.001Significant relationship.
- 5) Cultural and Organizational Willingness for Change:

- a. **F(2, 73) = 20.968**, **p < 0.001** Significant relationship.
- 6) Perceived financial Impact:
 - a. F(1, 73) = 0.383, p = 0.538 Not significant.
- 7) **Regulatory and Legal Environment**:
 - a. F(2, 73) = 4.361, p = 0.016Significant relationship.
- 8) Market Competition and Industry Trends:
 - a. F(2, 73) = 176.354, p < 0.001Significant relationship.
- 9) Economic and Business Environment:
 - a. F(1, 73) = 5.547, p = 0.021Significant relationship.
- 10) Customer Expectations and Demand:
 - a. F(3, 73) = 3.358, p = 0.023
 - Significant relationship.
- 11) Technological Infrastructure and Resources:
 - a. F(2, 73) = 6.892, p = 0.002
 - Significant relationship.
- 12) Vendor/Provider Trust and Expertise:
 - a. **F(3, 73) = 11.442**, **p < 0.001** Significant relationship.
- The overall model is statistically significant, indicating that the attitude of lenders towards AI-based credit scoring is influenced by multiple factors.
- Most factors show significant relationships with lenders' attitudes.
- Perceived Financial Impact is the only factor that did not show a significant relationship.

8. Discussion

The integration of AI-based credit scoring offers several advantages, such as improved precision in assessing credit risk and enhanced operational efficiency. However, challenges like data privacy issues and potential biases in algorithms must also be addressed. The results from hypothesis testing indicate a significant relationship between lenders' attitudes toward adopting AI and various influencing factors. Specifically, knowledge and familiarity with AI technology, trust in AI algorithms, institutional risk appetite, and the availability of technological infrastructure were identified as key elements impacting these attitudes. The overall sentiment among respondents was positive regarding AI, suggesting a widespread belief in its transformative potential for credit scoring processes. This positive outlook is consistent with the growing focus on technological advancements in the financial sector and underscores the importance of educating lenders about AI's functionalities to boost their confidence and willingness to adopt it. While perceived financial impact did not emerge as a significant factor, this suggests that lenders may prioritize other aspects over direct financial considerations. These findings highlight the importance of fostering a culture of innovation within financial institutions. By understanding these relationships, the financial industry can move towards more efficient and fair lending solutions.

9. Limitations of the Study:

Following limitations can be taken into the consideration

- The sample size may not fully represent the diversity of lenders in the financial sector, potentially affecting the generalizability of the findings.
- The focus on specific factors influencing lenders' attitudes may overlook other relevant aspects that could impact AI adoption in credit scoring.
- The research is conducted in a specific geographic context i.e. in Mumbai, which may limit the applicability of the results to other regions or countries with different regulatory and market conditions.
- The study does not account for the dynamic nature of technological advancements in AI, which may rapidly change the landscape of credit scoring.
- Potential biases in lenders' self-reported attitudes could affect the accuracy of the findings regarding their perceptions and experiences with AI technology.
- Moreover, statistical tests applied for the purpose of hypothesis testing, have their own limitations

10. Recommendations:

As the financial landscape continues to evolve with the increasing integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in credit scoring, it is essential for financial institutions and policymakers to adopt innovative strategies that enhance the effectiveness and accessibility of these systems. While the benefits of AI-based credit scoring are evident, the challenges that accompany its implementation necessitate proactive and forward-thinking recommendations. The following suggestions aim to provide new directions for financial institutions and policymakers, focusing on not only improving the technology itself but also fostering an inclusive environment where AI can thrive. By addressing these recommendations, stakeholders can work towards a more effective and equitable AI-based credit scoring system that benefits both lenders and borrowers.

- 1) **Develop Hybrid Credit Scoring Models**: Encourage financial institutions to adopt hybrid models that combine traditional credit scoring methods with AI-driven analytics, offering a more comprehensive view of a borrower's creditworthiness.
- 2) Utilize Alternative Data Sources: Explore the integration of alternative data sources, such as social media activity and utility payment histories, to enhance credit scoring models and improve access to credit for underserved populations.
- 3) **Implement Real-Time Credit Scoring**: Advocate for the development of real-time credit scoring systems that utilize AI algorithms to evaluate borrowers continuously, allowing for dynamic adjustments based on changing financial behaviors.

- 4) **Create User-Friendly AI Tools**: Design intuitive and user-friendly AI tools for lenders to facilitate the adoption of AI-based credit scoring without requiring extensive technical knowledge.
- 5) Establish Ethical Oversight Committees: Financial institutions should create independent ethical oversight committees to review and ensure the fair use of AI in credit scoring, focusing on accountability and transparency.
- 6) Focus on Consumer Personalization: Leverage AI to create personalized lending solutions that consider individual borrower profiles and preferences, enhancing customer satisfaction and engagement.
- 7) Encourage Cross-Industry Collaborations: Promote collaborations between financial institutions and tech companies, fostering an ecosystem where knowledge-sharing and innovation can drive advancements in AI-based credit scoring.
- 8) **Implement AI Literacy Programs for Consumers**: Introduce AI literacy initiatives aimed at educating consumers about how AI credit scoring works, its benefits, and its limitations, empowering them to make informed financial decisions.
- 9) **Pilot Community-Based Credit Programs**: Initiate community-based credit scoring pilot programs that involve local businesses and organizations, providing insights into how AI can be tailored to meet the specific needs of diverse communities.
- 10) **Explore Blockchain for Data Security**: Investigate the potential of blockchain technology to enhance data security and privacy in AI-based credit scoring systems, addressing concerns about data breaches and fraud.

11. Conclusion:

In conclusion, the integration of AI-based credit scoring systems represents a transformative opportunity for the financial sector, promising enhanced accuracy, improved operational efficiency, and streamlined decision-making processes. Throughout this study, we have explored the substantial benefits AI can bring, such as the ability to analyze vast datasets for more accurate risk assessments, thereby potentially expanding access to credit for underserved populations. However, these advancements come with significant challenges, including data privacy concerns, potential biases in algorithmic decision-making, and the need for transparency and accountability in AI processes. The findings indicate that lenders' attitudes towards AI adoption are shaped by several influencing factors, including their familiarity with the technology, trust in AI algorithms, and the institution's cultural and organizational readiness for change. Notably, while perceived financial impact did not emerge as a significant factor, it underscores the importance of aligning AI adoption strategies with the practical needs and concerns of lenders. This highlights the necessity for financial institutions to invest substantially in technological infrastructure and resources to support effective AI implementation. To fully realize the potential of AI in credit scoring, it is imperative that financial institutions and policymakers adopt innovative approaches that not only address the existing challenges but also cultivate a culture of continuous learning and adaptation. These strategies should include enhancing training programs for lenders to build

confidence in AI tools, establishing robust regulatory frameworks that promote ethical AI use, and fostering collaboration among stakeholders to share best practices. Ultimately, by addressing the barriers to AI adoption and embracing innovative solutions, the financial sector can enhance the effectiveness and fairness of credit assessments, paving the way for a more inclusive and equitable financial landscape. This proactive approach will not only benefit lenders and institutions but also empower consumers, contributing to economic growth and stability in the broader financial ecosystem.

12. References:

- Chuen, D. L. K., Teo, E. G. S., & Wong, C. (2017). "Cryptocurrency: A New Investment Opportunity?" *Journal of Investment Management*, 15(3), 1-16.
- Feng, J., Zhao, Y., & Zhao, J. (2020). "Big data and machine learning in credit risk modeling: A survey." *European Journal of Operational Research*, 285(2), 387-401.
- Ghosh, A., & Reilly, M. (2020). "Machine learning in credit risk: A systematic review." *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 116, 105840.
- Kauffman, R. J., Lee, H. Y., & Liu, M. (2022). "The Role of AI in Finance: Theory and Applications." *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 39(3), 682-709.
- Khandani, A. E., Kim, A. J., & Lo, A. W. (2010). "Consumer credit-risk models via machine-learning algorithms." *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 34(11), 2767-2787.
- Lipton, Z. C. (2016). "The Mythos of Model Interpretability." *Communications of the ACM*, 61(3), 36-43.
- Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Kohane, I., & EHRs, W. (2019). "Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations." *Science*, 366(6464), 447-453.
- Ranjan, J., Rao, K. S., & Kumar, S. (2020). "Adoption of Artificial Intelligence in Banking: A Study of Factors Influencing the Adoption of AI in Indian Banks." *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 38(6), 1263-1281.
- Zarsky, T. (2016). "The Trouble with Algorithmic Decisions: An Analytic Roadmap to Examine Algorithmic Governance." *Buffalo Law Review*, 66, 321-355.

-.-.-.

199